arXiv:1602.00989v1 [stat.AP] 2 Feb 2016

A Gamma-Poisson Model for Normalizing Archaeological Assemblages

Stephen A. Collins-Elliott*

Department of Classics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

February 3, 2016

Abstract: Weighting artifact counts in archaeology has typically followed either a spatial or frequency-based approach. The following paper proposes a Bayesian inferential model using the Poisson distribution to normalize counts of artifacts as a rate, when comparing assemblages from archaeological projects of differing intensities.

The normalization of archaeological data is a necessary step in making quantitative comparisons between assemblages. Whether defining the scale of the assemblage within or across stratigraphic units, phases, or sites, the resulting quantities of finds are subject to the influence of the collection process. More intensive archaeological fieldwork in one area or site will result in larger gains, an intuition which has been observed, for example, in site recovery counts in surface surveys.[1] Thus, higher values at one site of an artifact-type might be due just as much to more fieldwork. Two modes of data normalization have been used to account for this issue. Surface area or volume can be used to obtain a density, a measure of find per square or cubic meter. Or, counts are divided by the sum of the assemblage, treating them as a relative frequency. Such avenues may not always be

*Email: sce@utk.edu.

[1] Plog, Plog, and Wait (1978); Terrenato (2004).

feasible, or desirable, given the case at hand, especially in trying to determine the scale or dimension of use-rates of a particular type of artifact in a given locale.

The following paper provides a way to normalize counts recovered from different contexts on the basis of a rate of fieldwork.[2] Spatial normalization may not always be feasible or facile, and frequency-based normalization likewise may prove undesirable if examining the distribution of just one class of material across several contexts. A time-based approach may have some utility either alongside or in place of other methods. Quantification is here set forward in Bayesian terms, as an estimate of material in an unknown past, systemic context, where archaeological evidence acts to improve our probable estimates.[3] Given our initial estimate $p(\theta)$, the prior probability, the observation of archaeological data, contained in $l(x|\theta)$, the likelihood, will be proportional to our posterior probability $\pi(\theta|x)$.

Consider a quantity of find whose use-date could run anywhere from moment a to b. Since it is easier to work in time intervals than continuous time, we can generalize to the duration of a set of time intervals $j_a, \ldots, j_b$. The probability that this artifact could have been in use in each interval will be $1/(j_b - j_a + 1)$. For example, if our time-interval is a quarter-century (each j is equivalent to 25 years), the probability that an artifact dating to the first century CE was in use will have a probability of 0.25 in each of the four time intervals of that century, 1-25 CE, 25-50 CE, 50-75 CE, and 75-100 CE. The expected value for each time interval j is will be the sum of the probabilities of the artifacts whose date can be assigned to that interval. For a set of n artifacts, where x is the quantity of that artifact, the expected value of that interval will be

$$E[X]_j = \sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k p_k$$

[2]This paper does not delve into the specifics of quantification itself, which are particular to the class of material involved (e.g., ceramic or glass vessels, lithic assemblages, as well as faunal and archaeobotanical remains). See Baxter (2003, pp. 210-221); Orton (2000, pp. 44-57).

[3]Baxter (2003, pp. 176-186); Buck, Cavanagh, and Litton (1996).

where $p_k \sim \text{Ud}(j_a, j_b)$. This method was first implemented by Lisa Fentress and Phil Perkins in their examination of exportation rates of African Red Slip ware, and continues to be used widely today in Roman archaeology to quantify material over time.[4] Determining the start and end dates of the find can be based on conventional estimates of the date of production as well as stratigraphic relationships that might provide helpful *termini ante quem*.[5]

The model proposed here proceeds from this expected value and then applies a weighting measure in order to ensure comparison. I start by recognizing that $E[X]_j$ is itself a rate, measuring the combined rate of loss and recovery of an artifact in the past and present, a quantity $\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k p_k$ per time interval j. Hidden within this expected value, though, is the rate of intensity of fieldwork, understood as the duration of an excavation or survey, represented by the time interval t_i, particular to that context i, whether defined as a stratigraphic unit, phase, or site. That is, we can express the expected value as

$$\lambda = \frac{t_i E[X]_j}{t_i}$$

Since this combined loss/recovery rate is a series of time-independent events, the Poisson distribution serves as an ideal way to model it. Comparing these quantities from different archaeological projects, where each has its own t_i, we have take into consideration the deficit of intensity, $\tau_i = \max(t_0, \ldots, t_m) - t_i$, in effect the "missing time" of fieldwork that would be necessary to equalize the application of work across m number of contexts (e.g., sites or projects, or possibly even stratigraphic units). We can then let y_i be the probable quantity of

[4] Fentress and Perkins (1987).

[5] Consideration of potentially residual materials, that is to say, those finds that are part of the "death" assemblage of the deposit when the artifacts of the systemic context were in use, can be made in accord with the scale of the scope of the study. Taking a sufficiently broad scale of comparison, a reasonable vicinity for the use of artifacts can be established in a way that encompasses even residual finds. After all, even residual materials have quantitative value; and the categorization of finds as "residual" is to let formation processes influence the selection of what is being quantified, rather than trying to accommodate the evidence notwithstanding its own object history and trajectory through its post-primary use period.

finds to result from this probable duration. In other words, we have an imaginary rate of

$$\frac{\tau_i y_j}{\tau_i}$$

that has to be considered for every actual λ. Since we are construing quantification in terms of a rate, of time-based independent events, a theoretically appropriate distribution to model this probability can be found in the Poisson distribution.[6] Thus, using a Bayesian framework with conjugate Gamma-Poisson model, where $l \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ and $p \sim \text{Gamma}(\tau_i y_j, \tau_i)$, the resulting posterior density can be derived analytically as $\pi \sim \text{Gamma}(t_i E[X]_j + \tau_i y_j, t_i + \tau_i)$, and the resulting mean will be

$$\frac{t_i E[X]_j + \tau_i y_j}{t_i + \tau_i}$$

Of course, as $\tau_i \to 0$, the probable expected value will converge on the actual value obtained in the course of archaeological work. Less intensively explored or excavated contexts will have a higher τ_i, which will more greatly impact the inferential result. In a word, the amount of archaeological materials collected is subject not only to how much there was deposited in the past, but also how much time has been put into collecting them in the present.

This model assumes that the number of participants in each archaeological project will be equal, and, for the broad purposes of the model, slight variation in the number of participants or teams engaged in fieldwork may not occasion an important change in the resulting distribution. That said, a scalar variable that introduces the size of project into the model can be introduced to each t_i or τ_i, if necessary.

It remains to specify what might be anticipated in the quantity y_j of the prior probability. This is perhaps where Bayesian inference and archaeological or historical estimation can work together. It is often the case in archaeology that the data in the likelihood are scarce or that there is a small "sample size" of finds which is taken to preclude any meaningful comparison. In this model, at least, such concerns might be mitigated through the use of an informed prior,

[6] Buck, Cavanagh, and Litton (1996, pp. 180-81) first proposed the use of the Poisson distribution to model artifact recovery rates.

which can be estimated on the basis of any number of appropriate rationales.

One such rationale might be an expected regional or area mean value that serves as the hypothetical value of y_j. Other instances for y_j might be the maximum $E[X]$, or, 0, to provide an interval estimate of the posterior mean. A value of $y_i = 0$ would have, in some cases, the potential to decrease the posterior mean, while choosing a maximum $E[X]$ or otherwise realistically high value provides a maximum ceiling. The model thus mitigates the effects of project intensity on estimations of the loss/recovery rate, thereby freeing up the counts for discussion on the basis of cultural and depositional factors which might have impacted the resulting posterior mean.

References

Baxter, M.J. (2003). *Statistics in Archaeology*. London: Arnold Publishers.

Buck, C.E., W.G. Cavanagh, and C.D. Litton (1996). *Bayesian Approach to Interpreting Archaeological Data*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Fentress, E. and P. Perkins (1987). "Counting African Red Slip Ware". In: *L'Africa romana* 5, pp. 205–214.

Orton, C.R. (2000). *Sampling in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plog, S., F. Plog, and W. Wait (1978). "Decision Making in Modern Surveys". In: *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Ed. by M. Schiffer. Vol. 1. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 383–421.

Terrenato, N. (2004). "Sample Size Matters! The Paradox of Global Trends and Local Surveys". In: *Side-by-Side Survey. Comparative Regional Studies in the Mediterranean World*. Ed. by S.E. Alcock and J.F. Cherry. Oxford: Oxbow Books, pp. 36–48.